

CACWG QUESTIONS – MEETINGS 8, 9, 10

NO.	QUESTION	RESPONSE												
1)	What is the height of Moynihan and how does that height compare to the GPP building heights?	Moynihan Train Hall is just over 100’ tall. Base heights in the Draft Design Guidelines are currently 200’, but these are still under review.												
2)	How was 33 FAR determined to be appropriate for three of the GPP sites?	Please see the response to Robert Atterbury’s question on page 8 of the CACWG #8 Meeting Minutes.												
3)	How will the proposed GPP buildings impact sunlight patterns and shadows on the area, including Moynihan and open spaces?	The DEIS Chapter 7 details shadow effects of the proposed GPP buildings on the surrounding area.												
4)	Development on Sites 4 and 5 would encroach on the existing POPS for One Penn. How much square footage of POPS would be lost?	<div>POPS Calcs (in SF)</div> <div>Original 1972 application</div> <table><tr><td>Plaza Bonus area</td><td>50,095.50</td></tr><tr><td>Arcade Bonus area</td><td>3,822.00</td></tr></table> <div>Post GPP</div> <table><tr><td>Plaza Bonus area</td><td>13,770.25</td></tr><tr><td>Arcade Bonus area</td><td>1,820.00</td></tr></table> <div>Variance</div> <table><tr><td>Plaza Bonus area</td><td>(36,325.25)</td></tr><tr><td>Arcade Bonus area</td><td>(2,002.00)</td></tr></table>	Plaza Bonus area	50,095.50	Arcade Bonus area	3,822.00	Plaza Bonus area	13,770.25	Arcade Bonus area	1,820.00	Plaza Bonus area	(36,325.25)	Arcade Bonus area	(2,002.00)
Plaza Bonus area	50,095.50													
Arcade Bonus area	3,822.00													
Plaza Bonus area	13,770.25													
Arcade Bonus area	1,820.00													
Plaza Bonus area	(36,325.25)													
Arcade Bonus area	(2,002.00)													
5)	On Slide 42, why does it say Penn Station when it is the entrance to MSG?	The slide indicates entrances to both.												
6)	What will be the ceiling height in various parts of the Penn Expansion given the presence of buildings above?	The design of the Penn Expansion is not finalized, so we are not able to answer this question at this time.												
7)	Will the controls include height and maintaining the line of sight for the Empire State Building from the west from the 33 rd Street station entrance and from Manhattan West?	<div>Additional Empire State Building view studies are being conducted, and the results will be posted to Huddle in a future update.</div> <div>The only height limit control in the Design Guidelines is for Site 1A (the “dogleg”), which has a height cap of 400’. Some views of ESB would likely be blocked by buildings; examples can be found in the DEIS, Chapter 9, and in additional view studies recently added.</div>												
8)	Is there a rendering of the light tunnel/train hall between 31 st and 30 th Streets over Block 780?	No.												

NO.	QUESTION	RESPONSE
9)	Proposed standard base height is 200 feet, and as-of-right is 150 feet. Why the increase? And, how does this compare to the height of Moynihan?	Moynihan Train Hall is just over 100' tall. Base heights in the Draft Design Guidelines are currently 200', but these are still under review.
10)	The proposed setback above the base of 200 feet is 15 to 25 feet from the property line. If the streetwall façade is set back from the property line, shouldn't the setback from the base be from the façade, not the property line?	Because there are significant sidewalk widenings required throughout the district, we are measuring the tower setback from the property line.
11)	There should be a study of sunlight progression (through all 4 seasons) and shadow creation of proposed buildings. The configurations of setbacks could then take into consideration the best way to insure as much light as possible enters the entire "Empire Station Complex" neighborhood and the new space we're creating.	The DEIS Chapter 7 details shadow effects of the proposed GPP buildings on the surrounding area. The shadow studies in the DEIS were conducted in accordance with the guidance in the CEQR Technical Manual.
12)	It would be helpful to have an origin-destination study of the commuters broken down by railroad service (LIRR, Metro-North, NJ Transit, and Amtrak).	Please see Slide 6 of the AKRF presentation shown at CACWG #9.
13)	Does the DEIS call for the addition of new protected bicycle lanes?	The GPP calls for strengthening the bike lane network within the district, including a potential new bike lane on 31 st St. Lanes have not yet been designed, so it is not yet determined if 31 st would be a standard or protected bike lane.
14)	Can MTA provide the data that supports its determination that only two new elevators are needed and the data that supports the selection of the eight escalators that will be rehabilitated?	The three stations are currently accessible. The two additional elevators are associated with other improvements that provide the opportunity to add them without needing to take property. These are not strictly required but are desirable. Eight escalators that service the B/D/F/M line platforms will be replaced with ones that are wider and faster to increase capacity since they are nearing the end of their useful lives.
15)	What are the plans for taxi, ride-hail and other on-demand transportation services at Penn Station?	Taxi lay-by lanes will remain on Seventh and Eighth Aves. The Seventh Ave lay-by is currently being redesigned by Vornado and DOT. There are no expected changes to 8th Ave lay-by lanes. Cross streets are expected to be primarily pedestrian oriented.
16)	Is there any way to revitalize and re-use the old passageway between Hotel Pennsylvania and Penn Station? This might be a third	There is no existing passageway between Hotel Pennsylvania and Penn Station that crosses under 7 th Ave, though there are 2 existing subterranean 7 th Ave crossings

NO.	QUESTION	RESPONSE
	underground crossing of Seventh Avenue in addition to the two new ones proposed by MTA.	that are part of the subway station. Additional crossings are part of a larger pedestrian concourse proposed in the GPP.
17)	Do the bicycle parking requirements reflect anticipated reduction in vehicles and traffic from congestion pricing?	The GPP bicycle parking requirements, which propose a major increase above standard zoning requirements, are intended to promote a bike commuter culture. Potential congestion pricing impacts have not been analyzed.
18)	Can we commit to full accessibility for mobility impaired individuals rather than simply complying with ADA requirements? The entire experience of transferring from one mode (e.g.: NJ Transit) to another mode (e.g.: MTA Broadway line) should be non-restrictive; someone in a wheelchair shouldn't be restricted to only one egress from a station to only one entrance to another station.	Please refer to the responses to Christine Berthet's questions about ADA and Elizabeth Goldstein's comment about airports found in the meeting minutes for CACWG #9.
19)	For bike storage, the plans for internal spaces for commuters is laudable, but can we make sure bicycle storage is at grade level with high visibility? The use of internal bike "garages" is likely to become a cultivated experience for occupants of the buildings, but there remains a need for high volume temporary storage such things as deliveries.	Given the desire for a mix of ground floor uses and ample new in-building station entrances, it is unlikely that all required bike parking would be on the ground floor of every building. If not located at grade, the Design Guidelines require the space to be located within one level of the ground floor with ease of access.
20)	In one meeting it was stated that Macy's plan would be taken into account in FEIS. The opposite was stated in a follow up meeting. Can you please confirm that Macy's up zoning will be taken into account?	The FEIS will take into account Macy's' proposed plan.
21)	Can you please provide the estimated budget for subway improvements presented in the GPP?	Please refer to the response to Layla Law-Gisiko's question found in the meeting minutes for CACWG #9 to be posted to Huddle.
22)	Are any of the connectors underground or above ground dedicated for private use?	No.
23)	What kind of approval and under what framework would the Attorney General and the Comptroller have to approve the GPP?	Neither the Attorney General nor the Office of State Comptroller need to approve the GPP.
24)	Can you share the Ernst & Young reports produced so far to inform the financing/funding decisions?	Ernst & Young has provided strategic advice in connection with the Empire Station Complex project but was not asked to produce a formal report. The presentation given by Tom Rousakis at CACWG #5 summarizes EY's work to date on the project.

NO.	QUESTION	RESPONSE
25)	<p>The data provided confirmed my findings that the west side volumes will grow very fast (176%) while the east side will probably decline by 5%. It is critical that agreement be reached and published on these assumptions as they underpin many important and costly decisions, e.g., which MTA stations to enhance, whether or where to build passageways, what intersections to study, where to locate grand entrances to the station, etc. We cannot afford to just assume the status quo when embarking on such a significant project.</p>	<p>The assumptions have been agreed to and published after extensive analysis. The data underlying the origin-destination assignments in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for ESC were derived from geographic distribution data obtained from ridership modeling done for the Environmental Impact Statements for East Side Access, the Hudson Yards rezoning and No. 7 line subway extension, and Moynihan. These related studies represent a comprehensive database that justifies trip assignments.</p> <p>The historical distribution of peak hour walk trips, based on comprehensive passenger counts at the station circa 2008, was 20% west and 80% east. The total future quantity of proposed office space on the far west side, when it is fully built out, caps the number of walk-west trips that are possible from the three commuter railroads combined. The west side rezoning Environmental Impact Statement quantified the full-build development potential, and the commuter rail walk trips from Penn Station were estimated based on the resulting trip generation and mode split analysis. Even with the full build-out of the west side, the future walk split was estimated to be 30% west and 70% east, which reflects the much larger quantity of Midtown office space that lies to the north and east of Penn Station. Again, these distributions have been extensively vetted and accepted in three previous Environmental Impact Statements.</p> <p>LIRR passengers will not sort themselves between Penn Station and GCT trains based solely, or even primarily, on proximity of the terminal to their workplace destination. That's an important factor, but not the only one. For example, not all LIRR branch lines will have direct one-seat ride service to Grand Central. The non-electrified branches will have direct dual-mode service only to Penn Station, and the lighter-density branch lines will have only a limited number of trains to GCT. On these branches, there will be significantly better service to Penn Station than to GCT. While the majority of Midtown workplaces are closer to Grand Central than Penn Station, approximately two-thirds of the LIRR's 2038 peak-hour service capacity, after LIRR acquires new rolling stock, completes associated infrastructure improvements, and re-balances service levels, will be operated to Penn Station, which will generally preserve the predominant west-to-east pedestrian flow in the AM.</p>

NO.	QUESTION	RESPONSE
		<p>We project that a significant number of LIRR riders with workplaces closer to Grand Central will still choose to ride LIRR trains to and from Penn Station because:</p> <p>(1) they prefer a one-seat ride to having to change trains at Jamaica or elsewhere; and/or</p> <p>(2) they prefer to ride less congested trains (with greater seating availability), which will generally be the trains operating to Penn Station.</p> <p>All these factors were considered in developing the distribution assumptions that resulted in the estimated 70% -30% directional split. While transportation engineers can reasonably disagree on the exact split, there is nothing in any of the data on which our analysis is based that would justify a 10% east/90% west split of future pedestrian growth.</p>
26)	There are 49 subway mitigation in total but only 8 on the west? Why?	The subway mitigations are either a direct response to a particular significant adverse impact disclosed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement or a response to an existing unacceptable Level of Service at a specific location that either needs to be improved in order for the direct mitigations to work properly without themselves causing an impact at an adjacent feature, or is an existing substandard feature that can be addressed as part of this project. (An example of the last category is widening two subway platforms.) The locations for the mitigations are based solely on these criteria.
27)	Why are the W 35th entrances to the 34th street A/C/E station not receiving any enhancements? What proportion of commuters do they serve?	There were no significant adverse impacts identified at those locations.
28)	Are any east-west passageways planned under 8th Avenue? We were told there would be when Moynihan was built.	No additional passageways are planned under Eighth Avenue.
29)	Will Penn extension be connected to the A/C/E station by an underground passageway? It would be particularly helpful to bypass the MSG theater where the sidewalk is a major pinch point for pedestrians.	Passengers using the Penn Expansion could reach the 8 th Avenue subway via the north-south concourses in the reconstructed Penn Station. This is the most direct connection possible. These movements have been accounted for in the alternatives under consideration for the Penn Reconstruction.
30)	What mitigations are proposed on the east side of 8th Avenue for pedestrians? Will all the MTA grates be modernized along both sides of the corridor to facilitate walking?	No specific improvements are planned here as part of the GPP.

NO.	QUESTION	RESPONSE
31)	We disagree that very different looking entrances to the stations are a plus. It pleases developers but it is very confusing for travelers and commuters.	Thank you for your input on this. No decisions have yet been made on station entrance design.
32)	How will you triple the number of bike shares slots in the study area? Would you consider installing bike share stations within the buildings?	New York's bike share program, known as Citibike, is run by the City of New York. We will coordinate with the relevant City agencies on future Citibike expansion and dock locations.
33)	Would you consider installing two-way bike lanes on both 33rd and 31st streets to improve connectivity with the avenues and request that they are continued east and west to the rivers?	NYC DOT oversees and determines bike lanes on City streets. ESD will coordinate with NYC DOT to evaluate two-way bike lanes in the project area.
34)	Will you install bike stations on W 30th street?	New York's bike share program, known as Citibike, is run by the City of New York. We will coordinate with the relevant City agencies on future Citibike expansion and dock locations.
35)	Is there a future origin-destination analysis based on transit #, development # and including the Port Authority?	The DEIS accounted for commuter patterns based on census data, inputs from the MTA, and geographic locations of future developments in the area in assigning future trips to the transportation network. ESD will coordinate with PANYNJ to address the projected ridership growth at PABT as appropriate in the ESC FEIS.